

1

2

3

4

5

Q

7

$$\begin{pmatrix}) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

Q

1

2

1 February 28, 2002. By letter dated April 12, 2002, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
2 position was properly allocated.

3
4 On April 22, 2002, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the
5 Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6
7 Appellant works in the Stormwater Program of the Southwestern Region Water Quality Program.
8 Appellant does not have statewide responsibilities. However, he is the regional staff person
9 responsible for assisting, coordinating and facilitating the planning process for local governments
10 (non-NPDES phase 1 municipalities) in the creation and modification of their storm water
11 management programs. Appellant oversees a portion of the Region's Stormwater Program, but he is
12 not responsible for producing storm water management plans. This responsibility lies with the
13 individual municipalities. Appellant's duties require him to consult with state agencies, local
14 governments, developers and other interested parties within the region.

15
16 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that his position meets the definition and
17 distinguishing characteristics of the EP 3 classification because he functions as a program manager.
18 Appellant contends that a program manager is analogous to a project manager as described by the
19 EP 3 classification. Appellant admits that he has not been designated a program manager, but
20 argues that such a designation is not required at the EP 3 level. Appellant asserts that the Director's
21 designee erred in using a comparison of his position to other EP 2 positions as a basis for denying
22 his reallocation. Appellant contends that the denial of his reallocation was based on vague internal
23 criteria rather than on the duties and responsibilities of his position compared to the classification
24 specifications. Appellant asserts that he works independently and is solely responsible for guiding
25 the storm water planning process for non-NPDES phase 1 municipalities in the Southwestern
26 Region. Appellant contends that his position is best described by the EP 3 classification.

1
2 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant does not have the level
3 of decision making responsibility anticipated by the EP 3 classification, does not supervise planning
4 specialists, does not serve as a project manager, and does not have state-wide responsibility for the
5 Stormwater Program. Respondent asserts that Appellant does provide advice and technical
6 assistance to local governments within the Southwestern Region. Respondent contends that
7 Appellant's level of responsibilities and the scope of his duties are best described by the EP 2
8 classification.

9
10 **Relevant Classifications.** Environmental Planner 2, class code 67410; Environmental Planner 3,
11 class code 67420.

12
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
15 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
16 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
17 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
18 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
19 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
20 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21
22 The definition for Environmental Planner 3 states: "[s]erves as an independent project manager
23 responsible for guiding the development of environmental resource plans, programs, policies or
24 regulations."

25
26 The distinguishing characteristics for Environmental Planner 3 state:

1 The associate planner level provides expertise and consultation to staff of various
2 environmental programs; or provides planning or policy development assistance to
3 staff from other state agencies, levels of government, or concerned organizations.

4 Appellant's duties and responsibilities are limited to the Stormwater Program, which is a portion of
5 the Southwest Region Water Quality Program. Appellant assists local governments in the creation
6 and modification of their storm water management programs. Local governments are responsible
7 for developing the plans. Appellant does not independently guide the development of plans,
8 programs, policies or regulations; rather he assists in this process. Appellant's position does not
9 encompass the scope, breadth or level of responsibilities envisioned by the EP 3 classification.

10
11 The definition for Environmental Planner 2 states: "[d]evelops, coordinates, and facilitates
12 planning processes for environmental resource plans, programs, policies and/or regulations."

13
14 The distinguishing characteristics for Environmental Planner 2 state:

15 This is the journey level of the environmental planner series. Incumbents develop
16 their own planning processes and require incidental supervision, while:
17 (1) developing environmental resource plans, programs, and/or projects; (2) review
18 permit applications and provide recommendation for agency action; OR
19 (3) conducting research of an environmental, economical, financial or natural
20 resources nature.

21 Appellant independently facilitates the planning process for local municipalities in the
22 Southwestern Region, reviews storm water management plans, and recommends modifications to
23 the plans. Appellant's position is encompassed by the definition and distinguishing characteristics of
24 the EP 2 classification.

25 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the determination of the
26 Director, dated April 12, 2002, should be affirmed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied, and the determination of the Director, dated April 12, 2002, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2002.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

René Ewing, Member